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| **Title** | Factors influencing project success: The impact of human resource management  Keyword : Project Success | Developing a value-centered proposal for assessing project success  Keyword : Project Success | What do software practitioners really think about project success: A cross-cultural comparison  Keyword : Project Success |
| **Research Objective** | -To investigate the impact of the life cycle stage, type and structure of a project on the relationship between the critical factors and project success | -This research defines the concepts of the net project execution cost (NPEC) and the net product operation value (NPOV). | -To determine cultural, motivational and technical aspects of project success.  -To identify what extent cultural issues impact perceptions of software project success |
| **Problem Statement** | -To show moderating effect between the project management and project success. | -Demonstrates how project success might be assessed based on the concepts of NPEC and NPOV | -Aimed towards developing software project success/risk analysis models which can aid project managers in identifying, analyzing and controlling potential risks during software development |
| **Scope of Study**  **Where**  **When**  **Who** | - The respondent chooses from project activity sector, the following project sectors were retained: information technology, engineering, construction, technological development, organizational development and so on. | - The ownership of the organization, client and the project team. | - Chilean software practitioners  - US practitioners |
| **Literature Review** | -Gobeli and Larson pointed out that each organizational structure in the project management context has its strengths and weakness.  - (Belassi and Tukel,1996) many factors can determine the success or failure of a project related to project management and to the organization but the project and team members as well as factors that are external to the project.  - Pinto and Slevin acknowledged  distinction between projects that fail because of external factors and ones that fail because of management mistakes.  - Pinto and Covin also confirmed that the activity sector of projects influences the importance of different success factors in the life cycle of projects.  -“Hubbard” noted, most major  project failures are related to social issues.  -“Todryk” revealed that a well-trained project manager is a key factor linked with project success because as a team builder, he/she can create an effective team. This view is supported by other studies on project-team training  and. | - Chan and Chan (1990s) conclude that time, cost and quality forms the “basic criteria to project success.  -Morris and Hough, Hamilton, Shenhar et al and Atkinso believes that project success should be viewed from different perspectives of the individual owner, developer, contractor, user, and the general public.  -de Wit and Baccarini stated that “the product may have functions and features, which each of has quality dimensions like reliability and performance and the success or failure of a project.  -“Freeman and Beale” advocate the use of the net present value (NPV) for measuring project success and successfully demonstrate that time is a variable in the project cost function  - Lipovetsky et al conclude that some dimensions of success are more important while others are “negligible”.  - Odusami concludes a survey by stating that “contrary to expectation, construction cost and time are not regarded as highly important”. | -Consequently, a single project may be considered successful by one stakeholder and a failure by another (Naquin and Tynan, (2003),(Walsh and Schneider) (2002)  -Highlight stakeholders differences when they are asked about their perceptions of the success or otherwise of project,(Glass, and Procaccino,1999) and (Verner,2002)  -A common perception is that a successful project satisfies business goals and meets its schedule (Baccarini,1999)(Linberg,1999),  (Pinto and Slevin,1988) and ( Wohlin et al and Von Mayrhauser,2000)    -Most project managers do not understand how to define a successful project or how to characterize project success  (Bennatan,2000)( Kanter,1998) and (Linberg,1999)  - A project is viewed as a success or failure depends on the perception of the person viewing the project (Pinto and Mandel,1990)(Wateridge,1995) |
| **Methodology** | -Used adapted version of Pinto Prescott’s Project Implementation Profile (PIP) as a measurement instrument  -A pre-test was carried out with 15 project management experts in more than ten Canadian organizations  -Construct Questionnaire proposed by Tsui’s dimensions  -212 questionnaires were distributed to project managers and 142 were returned, giving a response. | - NPV for measuring project success has been calculated by including all “discounted” cash inflows and outflows throughout project execution and product operation  -NPOV is limited to product operation only. | - 201 Chilean software development professionals responded to the questionnaire.  - use the *U* Mann–Whitney test to determine if distributions of responses in both studies are similar or different.    - Data was collected by using a questionnaire, which was defined and validated in the US study |
| **Findings** | -Project success measure from three viewpoints : sponsor's view, project manager's view and sponsor as project manager's view.  -P.I.P. instrument does not evaluate the motivation, the training, the experience, the commitment of the  as independent variables because the project managers are considered as crucial and central actors for success and effectiveness. | -The use of the single cost-value dimension for the purpose avoids the problem. Both NPEC and NPOV are seen from the client’s viewpoint.  - If NPEC and NPOV (or their estimates) can be agreed among project participants for a particular project, it is possible to have a single project success or failure verdict. Such an aligned view of project success can help project participants to make | -Defined four analysis clusters (process/personal, process project, outcome/personal and outcome/project)  - people establish a causal relationship between team-work and success, there must be a balance between self-control and stress.  -US respondents are product centered which, hypothetically, induces less stress.  -Chile are process-centered demanding more job satisfaction and better environmental condition. |
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| **Title** | Role of single-project management in achieving portfolio management efficiency  Keyword : Project Management | Project management : Unexpected events    Keyword : Project Management | Standardized project management may increase development projects success  Keyword: Project Manegement |
| **Research Objective** | - To identify how project managers, at the single-project level, can contribute towards wider business benefits in the entire project portfolio. | - To explores how unexpected events are dealt with in projects using qualitative case study data from four different cases | -To investigate on project performance in development projects in high-velocity industries. |
| **Problem Statement** | -To provide initial evidence on the potential linkage between single project management and portfolio efficiency | -This study aims at contributing to the stream of the literature inquiring into the links between a project and its environment. | - to identify factors that impact project success. |
| **Scope of Study** | -All organizations throughout Finland that had development activities carried out as projects.  -Non-profit associations were left out of the sample  -Development manager, development director, quality manager, product development manager, or R&D manager | - Main organizational form for developing and delivering products and services  - Development of medical equipment for blood tests and analysis staff  - CEO and the top management in health care organization  - Delivery of power plants staff  -Delivery of harbor equipment staff | - interviews with 12 project managers in six organization  -Review the related of SPM documents  -Observations |
| **Methodology** | -mailed questionnaire to collect data on project management and portfolio management efficiency.  -A Likert-type scale of 1 … 5 or 1 … 3 was used  -Before the actual delivery of the survey, the questions were tested for usability, relevance and validity with seven industry representatives. | -Data was collected through interviews and documents.  -visited several times to follow up on project progress and 10–20 interviews were conducted in each organization. | - Likert scale  - *T*-test indicate significant differences between the top group and the bottom group for each independent  - Interviews with five individuals from five companies |
| **Literature Review** | -(Fricke and Shenhar )have identified factors in the single-project–multi-project interface, relevant to efficiency at both levels.  -Cooper et al stated that studies by Fricke and Shenhar limited to product development, and they do not specifically look into single-project management | Engwall provides an important contribution, highlighting how parallel activities in the organizational context, experiences and pre-project processes, institutional forces and future aspirations come together in creating the project context  - “*practice turn”* the idea is to “bring work back”, using the words of Barley and | - (Toney and Powers) standardized process (approaches and procedures) is a success factor.  -(Kerzner) claims that standard PM metrics and tools impact standard PM methodology (i.e., process), which then influences project success.  -(Kerzner) organizational culture and information management systems impact project success as well.  -(Eisenhardt) demonstrate that process, communication, and interpersonal relationships (trust, respect, etc |
| **Findings** | - efficiency of project management was the strongest factor contributing to portfolio management.  -Project management efficiency was found as a significant mediating factor between single-project factors and portfolio management efficiency, whereas reaching of project goals mediated single-project factors and project management efficiency | -Projects run through different stages on their way to completion,where time is not always the most important defining factor but time is still an important factor used to distinguish between different  - Frequent interactions with the environment with an impact on project conditions or goals. “Revisions“, “re-openings“ and “daily fine tuning“ | - Companies tend to standardize PM only to a certain level (inflection point), while maintaining a certain level of flexibility. |